



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Applicant:

Murthi Nanja

Serial No.: 09/778,565

Filed: February 7, 2001

For: Aggregating Web Data on Clients
and Distributing the Aggregated
Data to Wireless Handheld Devices

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Art Unit: 2166

Examiner: Isaac M. Woo

Atty Docket: ITL.0521US
(P10765)

Assignee: Intel Corporation

Mail Stop **Appeal Brief-Patents**
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY BRIEF

In response to the new arguments raised in the Examiner's Answer, the following Reply Brief is submitted.

1. The References Teach Aggregating
on a Server, Not a Client, as Claimed

The Answer makes the observation that a client and the server are the same thing. This logic comes from the following analysis, which it is submitted is fundamentally flawed. Because the present application says the client can be a processor-based system, it is deduced that any processor-based system can be a client and, therefore, a server can be a client. Just because a client can be a processor-based system does not mean that every processor-based system is a client.

Date of Deposit: July 28, 2006

I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as **first class mail** with sufficient postage on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Cynthia L. Hayden
Cynthia L. Hayden

A client is a well known term of art. It is not a server. The argument is baseless and is sufficient to reverse in and of itself.

2. Single Connection Session


The Examiner now suggests that one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to use such a combination “because that would provide Khan’s system the enhanced auto-data and multiple data transmitting with a single communication session (without re-connection session) in network communication environment, especially Internet communication. Thus, the user can receive information in a regular base without the retrying connection session.” Of course, the problem with all this is that none of the references teach it. It is totally a figment of the Examiner’s imagination with the benefit of hindsight reasoning. In other words, all Ohashi says is, in one embodiment called multi-receiving, a plurality of pages of image data is sent in one communication session. Column 7, lines 55-60. But he never tells you any advantage or benefit of it. Therefore, he teaches no rationale to combine.

Moreover, Ohashi does not teach a wireless connection session. In other words, he just says you can do this in a non-wireless printer environment, but he never gives you any reason to do it and, therefore, provides no reason or rationale to try to do it in a wireless situation. The rationale posed by the Examiner is the Examiner’s rationale, not that of the prior art. Thus, a *prima facie* rejection is not made out.

Therefore, the rejection should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 28, 2006



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]
Attorneys for Intel Corporation